

PIERCE  
ATWOOD

**FAX COVER SHEET**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 26 2004

**OFFICIAL**

---

*To:* Examiner Michelle C. Flood, Art Unit 1654  
*Entity:* U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
*Fax Number:* 703-872-9306  
*Voice Number:*  
*From:* Patrick R. Scanlon  
*Date and Time:* May 26, 2004 10:23 AM  
*Total Pages:* 4

---

**Message:**

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
FOR APPLICATION NO. 10/655,935

5/26 10:46

---

Any message on this fax cover sheet, and any accompanying materials, may contain confidential, secret or privileged information, the disclosure, copying, or further dissemination of which is strictly prohibited under applicable law. Therefore, if this fax cover sheet is not addressed to you or if this fax cover sheet is addressed to you, but the accompanying materials do not appear to be intended for you, please do not read, copy or disseminate either any message on the fax cover sheet or the accompanying materials. Instead, please call us collect at 207.791-1279, and we will make arrangements for return of these materials at our expense.

*If you are having difficulties in receiving this, please call us at 207.791-1279. Thank you.*

---

For Pierce Atwood Office Use Only  
Client-Matter Number: 8010-2809

11

One Monument Square • Portland, Maine 04101 • 207.791.1100 • Fax 207.791.1350

- 1 -

Serial No. 10/655,935

Atty. Docket No. TOM2809US02

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 26 2004

OFFICIAL

In re Application of :  
 Stefan Gafner et al. : Group Art Unit: 1654  
 Serial No.: 10/655,935 : Examiner: Michelle C. Flood  
 Filed: September 5, 2003 : Response to Paper No.  
 For EXTRACT OF MAD-DOG SKULLCAP

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. 121

Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 26, 2004.

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the present application.

Restriction has been required between (I) claims 1 and 2, drawn to an extract of *Scutellaria laterifolia* L., (II) claims 3-7, drawn to a process for obtaining an extract of *Scutellaria laterifolia* L., (III) claims 8-11, drawn to a composition comprising an extract of *Scutellaria laterifolia* L. combined with a stabilizing agent, and (IV) claims 12-19, drawn to a process for obtaining an extract of *Scutellaria laterifolia* L. using a stabilizing agent. This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8 (a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

deposited with the United States Postal Service  
 with sufficient postage as first class mail in an  
 envelope addressed to:  
 Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

transmitted by facsimile to the  
 Patent and Trademark Office

Patrick R. Scanlon  
 Signature  
Patrick R. Scanlon

Date: 5/26/04

- 2 -

Serial No. 10/655,935

Atty. Docket No. TOM2809US02

The Examiner states that inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made and that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product. By way of example, the Examiner refers to the process disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,608,102 to Howell et al. However, while the process disclosed in Howell et al does arguably produce a product that is materially different from the product of claims 1 and 2, the process used by Howell et al is not the process as claimed in the present application. The process as claimed in claims 3-7 uses *Scutellaria laterifolia* L. plant material. Howell et al uses dried leaves or fruit of *Vaccinium macrocarpon* and does not use *Scutellaria laterifolia* L. plant material. Accordingly, there is no showing that the process as claimed could make another and materially different product.

For similar reasoning, applicant submits that U.S. Patent No. 2,774,714 to Hershberg et al does not show that the process as claimed in claims 12-19 could be used to make a product that is materially different than the product of claims 8-11.

The Examiner has provided no showing of how invention I is distinct from inventions III and IV (and *vice versa*) or how invention II is distinct from inventions III and IV (and *vice versa*).

For the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Applicant provisionally elects invention I, claims 1 and 2 for further prosecution. The remaining claims will be retained pending resolution of the traversal and possible rejoinder.

- 3 -

Serial No. 10/655,935

Atty. Docket No. TOM2809US02

An action on the merits is awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

5/26/04

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon  
Reg. No. 34,500  
207-791-1276